



8-1-1970

The Personality Traits of High School, College and Professional Football Coaches as Measured by the Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey

Wesley E. Andrud

Follow this and additional works at: <https://commons.und.edu/theses>

Recommended Citation

Andrud, Wesley E., "The Personality Traits of High School, College and Professional Football Coaches as Measured by the Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey" (1970). *Theses and Dissertations*. 3586.
<https://commons.und.edu/theses/3586>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Theses, Dissertations, and Senior Projects at UND Scholarly Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of UND Scholarly Commons. For more information, please contact und.common@library.und.edu.

1970
An 29

THE PERSONALITY TRAITS OF HIGH SCHOOL, COLLEGE AND
PROFESSIONAL FOOTBALL COACHES AS MEASURED BY THE
GUILFORD-ZIMMERMAN TEMPERAMENT SURVEY

by
Wesley E. Andrud

Bachelor of Science, Valley City State College 1967

A Thesis
Submitted to the Faculty
of the
University of North Dakota
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of
Master of Science

Grand Forks, North Dakota

August
1970

448089

This thesis submitted by Wesley E. Andrud in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Degree of Master of Science from the University of North Dakota is hereby approved by the Faculty Advisory Committee under whom the work has been done.

Robert W Clayton
(Chairman)

Andrew
Eldon M Galt

A William Johnson
Dean of the Graduate School

Permission

Title The Personality Traits of High School, College and Professional
Football Coaches as Measured by the Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament
Survey

Department Physical Education

Degree Master of Science

In presenting this thesis in partial fulfillment of the requirements for a graduate degree from the University of North Dakota, I agree that the Library of this University shall make it freely available for inspection. I further agree that permission for extensive copying for scholarly purposes may be granted by the professor who supervised my thesis work or, in his absence, by the Chairman of the Department or the Dean of the Graduate School. It is understood that any copying or publication or other use of this thesis or part thereof for financial gain shall not be allowed without my written permission. It is also understood that due recognition shall be given to me and to the University of North Dakota in any scholarly use which may be made of any material in my thesis.

Signature

Wesley Anderson

Date

7 - 28 - 70

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The writer wishes to express his thanks and appreciation for the valuable assistance rendered by Dr. Robert Clayton, Chairman of the Thesis Committee. Through Dr. Clayton's interest in the area of personality, this study was made possible. The writer is also grateful to Dr. Eldon Gade and Dr. A. W. Sturges for their interest, advice and encouragement.

The advisory assistance of Dr. John Quaday was considered a valuable asset for the completion of this study.

The writer would also like to thank Coach Jerry Olson for his assistance and cooperation in the gathering of the data.

Finally, the writer is sincerely appreciative for the coaches who volunteered their time and energy to make this study possible.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iv
LIST OF TABLES	vi
ABSTRACT	vii
Chapter	
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Purpose of the Study	
Need for the Study	
Delimitations	
Limitations	
Definitions of Terms	
Review of Related Literature	
Personality Research Related to Athletes	
Personality Research Related to Male Physical Educators	
Personality Research Related to Coaches	
Summary of Reviewed Literature	
II. METHODS AND PROCEDURES	20
Selecting the Test	
Gathering the Data	
III. RESULTS AND ANALYSIS OF DATA	22
Introduction	
Description of Subjects	
Results of Survey	
Summary	
IV. DISCUSSION	30
V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	33
REFERENCES	35

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Mean Scores of Male High School, College, and Professional Football Coaches on the Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey	23

ABSTRACT

The purpose of the study was to describe the personality characteristics of coaches as measured by the Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey. Of a population of approximately eighty coaches in attendance at the 1970 University of North Dakota Football Clinic, nineteen coaches volunteered to participate in the study.

Each individual's ten raw scores were grouped and added in order that the mean for each variable could be computed and recorded on the standard profile chart designed by Guilford and Zimmerman. The raw scores could then be interpolated into a percentile score when recorded on the personality profile chart.

It was found that three variables--general activity, emotional stability, and masculinity--resulted in mean scores which were around the seventieth percentile rank. Ambition, energy, and general activity were tendencies possessed by the coaches tested. The relatively high percentile score also indicates optimism and cheerfulness. These men can also be expected to behave in ways characteristic of men.

Three other variables--ascendancy, sociability, and personal relations--represented scores in the upper fiftieth percentile range. These traits indicate that leadership and social activity habits were characteristic of the coaches tested.

The following variables--restraint, objectivity, friendliness, and thoughtfulness--represented scores which ranked at the fiftieth

percentile. A score at or near the fiftieth percentile indicates the mean or average when compared to the norm group on the scale.

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

People are becoming increasingly aware of the variety of factors which contribute to the production of a winning athletic team. Knowledge of the game, facilities, equipment, administrative and community backing and player material are all important factors which contribute to coaching success. However, the coach's personality is also considered to be an important factor which contributes to athletic success.

Do coaches demonstrate or possess unique personality characteristics which sets them apart from the average individual? Do superior coaches demonstrate or possess personality differences when compared to average coaches? Certain coaches produce winning teams wherever they go and are in constant demand by administrators or athletic directors.

Some people feel the best type of coach is the dictatorial coach, who like Vince Lombardi, rules with an iron hand (1). On the other hand, George Allen, an "easy going" or democratic coach, took over the Los Angeles Rams after the Rams had experienced seven consecutive losing seasons and have since that time produced an annual contender (2). These two coaches appear to exhibit exactly opposite personalities, yet each has proven to be highly successful.

The various traits or needs of an individual are said to make up one's personality (3). Perhaps the personality needs are similar,

and were the driving force which caused these men to go into coaching. It could be that coaches like Lombardi or Allen are not opposites, but rather they may possess similar personality traits that are characteristic of most people in the coaching profession.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of the study was to analyze the personality traits of nineteen football coaches, using the Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey.

Need for the Study

Our country is becoming a nation of spectators, with reporters from every phase of the news media describing and comparing opposing coaches in a detailed manner. This is done in an attempt to expose newsworthy items that describe the personality characteristics of each coach. With members of other professions describing and comparing the qualities of coaches, a professional rather than a layman's look at members within the coaching profession would be beneficial.

To identify the personality traits of coaches would help coaches understand other coaches, as well as aid the public and prospective coaches in understanding the coaching profession. The possible findings could be used for guidance purposes in teaching those young men interested in entering the coaching profession.

Delimitations

The personality traits of high school, college, and professional football coaches in several sports were studied in an attempt to describe the personality of coaches. The study was limited to nineteen coaches ranging

in age from 25-54 years who were surveyed during the University of North Dakota Football Clinic. The survey was administered to only those coaches willing to participate in the study. The study was limited to the Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey and the ten variables it measures.

Limitations

The limitations imposed on this study are that the participants will participate seriously, and that an accurate profile of the coaches' personality may be described. The individual's mood or attitude toward the personality survey could not be controlled although it may have affected the participant's response to some of the test questions. The study is also limited by the testing instrument itself because of the number of variables it measures.

Definitions of Terms

Personality: The sum of the qualities or characteristics peculiar to some individual rational being; the prominent traits or attributes of some particular person (4).

Psychological needs as described by Edwards (5).

1. **Achievement:** to do one's best, to be successful, to accomplish tasks requiring skill and effort, to be a recognized authority, to accomplish something of great significance, to do a difficult job well, to solve difficult problems and puzzles, to be able to do things better than others, to write a great play or novel.
2. **Deference:** to get suggestions from others, to find out what others think, to follow instructions and do what is expected, to praise others, to accept the leadership of others, to read about great men, to let others make decisions.
3. **Order:** to have written work neat and organized, to make plans before starting on a difficult task, to have things organized, to keep things neat and orderly, to make advance plans when taking a trip, to organize details of work, to keep letters and files according to some system, to have meals organized and a definite time for eating, to have things arranged so that they run smoothly without change.

4. Exhibition: to say witty and clever things, to tell amusing jokes and stories, to talk about personal adventures and experiences, to have others notice and comment upon one's appearance, to say things just to see what effect it will have on others, to talk about personal achievements, to be the center of attention, to use words that others do not know the meaning of, to ask questions others cannot answer.
5. Autonomy: to be able to come and go as desired, to say what one thinks about things, to be independent of others in making decisions, to feel free to do what one wants, to do things that are unconventional, to avoid situations where one is expected to conform, to do things without regard to what others may think, to criticize those in positions of authority, to avoid responsibilities and obligations.
6. Affiliation: to be loyal to friends, to participate in friendly groups, to do things for friends, to form new friendships, to make as many friends as possible, to share things with friends, to do things with friends rather than alone, to form attachments, to write letters to friends.
7. Intracception: to analyze one's motives and feelings, to observe others, to understand how others feel about problems, to put oneself in another's place, to judge people by why they do things rather than by what they do, to analyze the behavior of others, to predict how others will act.
8. Succorance: to have others provide help when in trouble, to seek encouragement from others, to have others be kindly, to have others be sympathetic and understanding about personal problems, to receive a great deal of affection from others, to have others do favors cheerfully, to be helped by others when depressed, to have others feel sorry when one is sick, to have a fuss made over one when hurt.
9. Dominance: to argue for one's point of view, to be a leader in groups to which one belongs, to be regarded by others as a leader, to be elected or appointed chairman of committees, to make group decisions, to settle arguments and disputes between others, to persuade and influence others to do what one wants, to supervise and direct the action of others, to tell others how to do their jobs.
10. Abasement: to feel guilty when one does something wrong, to accept blame when things do not go right, to feel that personal pain and misery suffered does more good than harm, to feel better when giving in and avoiding a fight than when having one's own way, to feel the need for confession of errors, to feel depressed by inability to handle situations, to feel timid in the presence of superiors, to feel inferior to others in most respects.
11. Nurturance: to help friends when they are in trouble, to assist others less fortunate, to treat others with kindness and sympathy, to forgive others, to do small favors for others, to be generous with others, to sympathize with others who are hurt or sick, to show a great deal of affection toward others, to have others confide in one about personal problems.

12. Change: to do new and different things, to travel, to meet new people, to experience novelty and change in daily routine, to experiment and try new and different jobs, to move about the country and live in different places, to participate in new fads and fashions.
13. Endurance: to keep at a job until it is finished, to complete any job undertaken, to work hard at a task, to keep at a puzzle or problem until it is solved, to work at a single job before taking on others, to stay up late working in order to get a job done, to put in long hours of work without distraction, to stick at a problem even though it may seem as if no progress is being made, to avoid being interrupted while at work.
14. Heterosexuality: to go out with members of the opposite sex, to engage in social activities with the opposite sex, to be in love with someone of the opposite sex, to kiss those of the opposite sex, to be regarded as physically attractive by those of the opposite sex, to participate in discussion about sex, to read books and plays involving sex, to listen to or to tell jokes involving sex, to become sexually excited.
15. Aggression: to attack contrary points of view, to tell others what one thinks about them, to criticize others publicly, to make fun of others, to tell others off when disagreeing with them, to get revenge for insults, to become angry, to blame others when things go wrong, to read newspaper accounts of violence.

Psychological needs as described by Guilford and Zimmerman (6).

G--General Activity: A high score indicates strong drive, energy and activity. This individual would generally tend to be enthusiastic, quick, lively, productive and efficient. Depending on the other qualities he possesses, it may, however, indicate a bad trait. For example, if the individual is inclined to be domineering, a high G score will make this even more pronounced. On the other hand, a low G score would seem to indicate a slow, deliberate, inactive quality in that person.

R--Restraint: If a person scored above average in the restraint category he is said to be serious-minded, deliberate, persistent and self-controlled. An extremely high score could indicate an over-serious individual, and coupled with a high activity level would mean that the individual has an internal conflict. Too much restraint and a low G score would indicate low output. Supervision activities would not be well suited to an impulsive, carefree individual that scores low in restraint.

A--Ascendancy: The amount of ascendancy which is desirable in a particular individual depends largely on the personalities of those he is to supervise. A very high A score must be balanced with high scores on T, R, M, and F. In the category of people who score high in ascendancy are the qualities of self-defense and leadership habits in speaking with individuals, to the public, and in persuading others. The person would also tend to do more bluffing and would be more conspicuous. On the other

end of the scale is the person scoring low in ascendance. He is said to be submissive, and has hesitation in speaking in public and with individuals. He tries to avoid being conspicuous.

- S--Sociability: The chief trait in consideration here is that of social participation. A high score in sociability means that the individual is inclined to have many friends and acquaintances. In addition he likes conversation and social activities. He may actually seek the limelight. Conversely, a low score in this category includes avoidance of social contacts and the person tends to refrain from conversation and is usually shy.
- E--Emotional Stability: An above average score means a high degree of optimism and cheerfulness. The individual has little fluctuation in his moods, is composed, and seems to feel in good health. Basically, this would indicate a desirable emotional stability unless it is coupled with a low score in general activity, which might mean that the person is lazy and sluggish. Scoring low in emotional stability has been defined as meaning the person has a greater degree of fluctuation in his moods. He is pessimistic and tends to daydream. Along with feeling in ill health, the person may be hampered by feelings of guilt, and worry. In general, a very low score would be a sign of a neurotic tendency.
- O--Objectivity: A very high score could indicate insensitivity, while a very low score could indicate touchiness. In general, a higher score means being "thickskinned" in opposition to being hypersensitive, self-centered, and suspicious.
- F--Friendliness: Scoring high in friendliness could mean a lack of fighting tendencies, or it could mean a realistic handling of frustrations and injuries, and a desire to be liked. This person has a high respect for others. A low score means hostility to a certain extent, and a fighting attitude. He may be belligerent and have contempt for others. Although he desires to dominate, he resists domination by others. A low score may not be entirely unfavourable, as many higher-ranking executives are below average in the F score, but on some occasions are able to capitalize on this. A good fighting spirit may be necessary for someone who must "battle" for the welfare of his group.
- T--Thoughtfulness: People who score high in thoughtfulness are reflective, philosophically inclined, self-observant and interested in thinking. They may have a small advantage over those who are more interested in overt activity because the extravert of this type is so busy interacting with his social environment that he fails to observe other people and may be lacking in tact.
- P--Personal Relations: This score represents the core of getting along with others. A person who scores high tends to be tolerant of others and their weaknesses. He has faith in social institutions. Persons who score low tend to find fault with other people and with institutions generally. This is the person who is not likely to "get along with others."
- M--Masculinity: A high raw score indicates that the man behaves in ways that are characteristic of men and is probably understood

and accepted by them. On the positive scale one is not easily disgusted, is resistant to fear and has little interest in clothing and styles. A very high score may mean that the person is callous or is attempting to compensate for feminine tendencies. A low score would indicate a tendency toward the feminine traits of sympathy, fear, romance, emotional expressiveness and interest in clothes and styles. Masculinity, then seems to be best tempered with enough refinements and "motherly" attributes to be responsible for those in their charge.

Review of Related Literature

Most people who want to become coaches tend to have participated in high school and college athletics. After this athletic involvement, the athlete tends to become a physical educator and then a coach.

The literature presented below may be categorized into these three general areas: (1) personality research related to athletes, (2) personality research related to male physical educators, (3) personality research related to coaches.

Personality Research Related to Athletes

A number of studies have been reported comparing one group of athletes with another group or another variable. Some research has been done to identify the personality of athletes, in order to help coaches understand their players.

Booth's (7) research provides evidence that personality differences exist between college male athletes and non-athletes and between participants in individual sports, team sports, and team-individual sports. He also indicated that some of the test items could be used to discriminate between good and poor competitors. The non-athletes scored significantly higher on the interest variable, while the varsity athletes were significantly lower than the freshman athletes, freshman non-athletes and upperclass non-athletes on the anxiety variable. On

the dominance variable, varsity athletes and upperclass non-athletes were significantly higher than the two corresponding freshmen groups. On social responsibility, the upperclass non-athletes scored significantly higher than the other groups. The varsity athletes in individual sports were significantly distinguished from team sports athletes on the depression variable. The varsity individual sports performers scored significantly higher on the psychasthenia scale than did performers in team-individual sports. The good and poor competitors scored significantly higher on the dominance variable than did the freshman athletes who were rated as poor.

Lakie (8) studied 230 intercollegiate male athletes from a state university, a private university, and two state colleges to observe personality characteristics of certain groups. When the 230 athletes were grouped by sports, not taking into account the school attended, no significant differences were observed. Some differences measured within the groups were: football players at the private university had a lower mean score on the social introversion scale than did the track men at the university; at the state university, the tennis-golf group had a higher mean social maturity score than any other sports group; and both the basketball players and the wrestlers had a higher mean liberalism score than did the tennis-golf group.

Hughes (9) studied freshman letter and non-letter winners in baseball, basketball, cross-country, football, gymnastics, soccer, swimming, tennis, track and wrestling. The basketball players had a higher need to achieve than the other groups. On the autonomy variable the non-letter winners had a higher score than the double-letter winners. Wrestlers rated higher on the endurance variable and team sports groups

measured higher on the affiliation and nurturance variable when compared with the individual sports group.

Kroll and Peterson (10) studied six collegiate football teams and found that the winning teams scored lowest on social factors of love of people, kindness, sympathy and unselfishness as compared to the losing teams. Athletes receiving scholarships scored lowest of all on these factors.

Johnson, Hutton, and Johnson (11) studied twelve All-American athletes. The sportsmen included four football players, two lacrosse players, two wrestlers, two boxers, one trackman, and one rifle marksman. Five characteristics were outstanding. These were: (1) aggression; (2) possession of little inhibition of emotion (uncontrolled affect); (3) high anxiety; (4) a high level of intellectual aspiration; (5) an exceptional amount of self-assurance. These findings indicated to the researchers that being a champion was a felt necessity for those subjects.

Kjeldsen (12) observed the personality traits of young college men participating in gymnastics. The four groups used in the study consisted of Springfield College students on the freshman gymnastics team, students who failed to remain out for the team the entire season, and the top and bottom 33 per cent of the beginning freshman classes. The successful participants, the top 33 per cent group, did not differ significantly from the unsuccessful, bottom 33 per cent group, participants. The members of the freshman team scored significantly higher in deference, order, and abasement than did the candidates who dropped out. The unsuccessful gymnasts had higher scores on dominance.

Flanagan (13) studied different physical activity groups, and concluded that personality was a factor in the selection of physical

activity. He studied 221 male college students and found the following factors significant: (1) fencers were ascendant, and more feminine than any other group; (2) the basketball group was more masculine than any other group; (3) the volleyball group was more submissive, more introverted, and more emotionally unstable than any other group; (4) the badminton group was more extroverted than any other group.

Husman (14) administered three projective tests measuring "aggression" to a group of college male boxers, wrestlers, and cross-country runners. Boxers had less overall intensity of aggression than wrestlers and cross-country runners. Boxers were more likely than the other groups to direct aggression inward. Cross-country runners were more outwardly aggressive and had more ego defense than boxers.

La Place (15) studied the personality traits of major and minor-league baseball players. He reported significant differences in personality between the two groups. The major-league players were better able to apply their strong drive toward a definite goal by exercising self-discipline. They were also better able to adjust socially to professional baseball, and better able to get along with people. The major-league players also exercised more initiative.

Kroll (16) in another personality study of collegiate wrestlers studied 94 amateur and collegiate wrestlers who were on different levels of achievement in wrestling. No support was found for the suggestion that wrestlers may possess a neurotic profile. The wrestlers scored significantly above normal on tough-mindedness, self-reliance, and masculinity. Kroll noted that his results seemed to be similar to several other studies, showing few if any differences on personality

variables of wrestlers when compared with normative groups, other types of sport groups, or between varsity and junior varsity wrestlers.

A study by Leithwood (17) was conducted on forty-five different college male weight-trainers. Cattell's Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire was administered to the subjects. Fifteen of these subjects trained as a conditioning activity for another sport, fifteen trained to improve their physiques, and fifteen trained to increase their strength for weight-lifting competition. Results indicated that there were no significant differences in personality traits among the three groups.

Henry (18) administered a personality survey to student pilots, track athletes, physical education majors and weight-trainers. His findings indicated that weight-trainers were more neurotic, less ascendant, more extroverted and hypochondriac than physical education majors.

Thune (19) and Harlow (20) compared the personality traits of college male weight-trainers to other non-weight-training athletes. The results indicated that the weight-trainer significantly lacked self-confidence, felt more masculine than other men, had consequent feelings of rejection and felt an inability to cope with his environment.

Hunt (21) studied the personality differences between 111 university Negro and white male athletes, and non-athletes. The results suggested that white varsity athletes were significantly different and ranked higher in ascendance, responsibility, and emotional stability when compared to Negro and white non-athletes. It was found that white varsity athletes and Negro varsity athletes tend to have similar selected personality traits, as do Negro and white non-athletes. It was also concluded that athletes, regardless of ethnic background, tend to have different selected personality traits when compared to non-athletes.

Sperling (22), using four different personality tests, found there were significant personality differences between college male varsity and intramural athletes, as distinguished from those in a non-athletic group. The athletes were superior in personality adjustment scores, ascendance, and extroversion. Sperling also indicated that the athletes were more significantly motivated by a desire for power and, to a lesser extent, by a social love for people.

Nelson (23) and Langer (24) investigated the underlying relationship between athletic performance and anxiety. Football players who were rated high on performance had lower resting levels of anxiety with a rise in pre-game anxiety that was never beyond personal control. Players rated poorer in performance had significantly higher resting levels of anxiety or allowed pre-game anxiety to get out of control. Factor analysis of team profiles enabled the authors to describe the successful football player as having higher ego strength, being more adventuresome and bold, more self-disciplined, and below average fluctuations in anxiety and having better control from game to game. They concluded that the successful athlete has internal mechanisms for getting prepared for competition.

Carter and Shannon (25) reported finding personality pattern differences between high school male athletes and high school male non-athletes. The non-athletes excelled on the academic items of adjustment and the athletes excelled on the social and leadership items of the personality test.

Slusher (26) studied the personality traits of 400 male high school athletes in baseball, basketball, football, swimming, and wrestling. It was reported that the football and wrestling groups

displayed the most neurotic profiles of the five athletic groups. The basketball group deviated more from the norm than the other groups, displaying an over-concern with physical symptom and relative lack of repression, while the swimming group demonstrated the least neurotic profile of all athletic groups studied.

Behrman (27) investigated the personality traits of high school swimmers and non-swimmers. The following results were reported: (1) swimmers were more impulsive, sociable, hostile and belligerent than non-swimmers; (2) non-swimmers were more restrained and serious, shy and seclusive and more agreeable than swimmers; (3) learners were more emotionally stable and objective than the failing group; (4) non-learners were more subjective and hypersensitive than the learners; (5) the upper ability swimming group was more impulsive, ascendant and socially bold, sociable, hostile and belligerent than the lower ability group; (6) the lower ability group was more restrained and serious, submissive, shy and seclusive, friendly and agreeable than the upper ability group.

Black (28) studied differences between women judged "most athletic" and selected groups of other college women. The woman athlete rated significantly higher on masculinity, confidence, energy, and were freer from fear about health and less self-conscious.

Bird (29) compared the personality traits of college women who participated in basketball to those who participated in modern dance. The basketball group was significantly higher on the communality scale. The modern dance group rated significantly higher on the flexibility and femininity scales.

Ramsey (30) compared personality variables between women varsity basketball players and girls in the intramural basketball program. The

girls in the intramural programs had a greater tendency toward dominance and exhibition. The varsity players had a higher score on the nurturance variable.

Peterson (31) examined the personality traits of United States Olympic Team women who engaged in team sports as compared to those who engaged in individual sports. It was found that individual sport athletes were more dominant, self-sufficient, more independent minded, and less inhibited than team sport athletes. Team sport athletes were more socially dependent, practical in judgment, and less sensitive than the individual sport group. Both groups tended to be more socially aloof, intellectually brighter, more conscientious, aggressive and persistent when compared to the control group.

Neal (32) studied the personality traits of 47 women athletes competing in the 1959 Pan-American Games, and traits possessed by the normative group of 749 college women using the Edwards Personal Preference schedule. The sports included equestrian, fencing, gymnastics, swimming and diving, tennis, track and field, basketball and volleyball. The athletes rated significantly higher than the normative group in autonomy, achievement, and aggression. The variables which were significantly lower were order, affiliation, and nurturance.

Ogilvie (33) examined personality changes due to athletic competition. From his observations on competitive girl swimmers it was found that with greater success in competition, the girls become more outgoing and less reserved. It was also found that competition increases emotional stability and tough mindedness; with age, tension and anxiety reduced, more self-control and self-discipline are demonstrated, and there is a shift from apprehension and worry to self-confidence.

Johnsgard and Ogilvie (34) compared personality traits of professional race car drivers, on the basis of the drivers being professional achievers and amateur achievers. Success was significantly related to the needs of dominance, autonomy and aggression. Other data reported for driver trainees offers support for the generalization that men who seek to drive fast cars in competition share a highly predictable personality structure.

Ogilvie (35) has done extensive research on the personality of the athlete. His studies have shown that most types of athletes are usually extroverted. Athletes generally display qualities of achievement, dominance, psychological endurance, and aggression. Athletes possess low anxiety and an unusual capacity to handle emotions under stress conditions. They also possess a low level of neuroticism. The variable of self-abasement varies with the specific sport as does the need for affiliation.

Ogilvie (36) also reviewed various personality studies and has concluded that parental and educational emphasis should be placed upon the following traits if the concern is with the development of physical excellence: emotional stability, tough-mindedness, conscientiousness, controlled self-discipline, self-assurance, relaxed low tension level, trusting-free of jealousy, and for males, increased outgoing personality. It can be stated with some degree of certainty that those who retain their motivation for competition will have most of the following personality traits: ambition, organization, deference, dominance, endurance and aggression. Emotional maturity will range from above average to high average and be complemented by self-control, self-confidence, tough-mindedness, trustfulness, intelligence, high conscience development and

low levels of tension. Such traits as autonomy, exhibitionism and affiliation prove to be less general.

Personality Research Related to Male Physical Educators

Locke (37) examined the personality traits of 129 elementary and secondary male physical educators, and found the groups to rate significantly above other educators on succorance, affiliation and nurturance.

Lo Maglio's (38) detailed investigation of physical educators revealed several variables that describe the male physical educator. The physical educator was inclined to be: sociable, competitive, impulsive, capable of easily changing from one task to another, emotionally stable, adventurous, gregarious, frivolous, sentimental, cheerful, talkative, frank, persevering, determined, responsible, orderly and dominant.

Personality Research Related to Coaches

Ogilvie's (39) broad research and consulting experience has reinforced his belief and conclusion that one of the significant contributions to coaching success was personal awareness of an individual's strengths and weaknesses in terms of the psychological traits that make up one's personality. Investigations of the personality structure of men who were described as having reached the highest level of professional success supported the general statement that they differ greatly from national norms on a number of important traits of personality. Ogilvie studied 130 high school coaches. These men measured high in achievement need, deference, order, dominance, endurance, abasement, and aggression. They were low in needs intraception, exhibition, nurturance, and change.

This study supports Ogilvie's generalization that coaches measure higher in those traits which determine getting ahead, succeeding and do not necessitate personal involvement. Those traits of personality which contribute most to being sensitive and also support close interpersonal relationships seem less well developed aspects of their personality.

Hendry (40) studied the personality traits of 126 competitive male and female swimmers, ages 14 to 22 years and 56 coaches, ages 24 to 56 years. Swimmers and their own coaches were asked to rate each others' personality traits as measured by Cattell's 16 PF questionnaire. It appeared that coaches could gauge their swimmers accurately in certain aspects of personality, but they assessed them as more sociable, happy-go-lucky, conscientious, venturesome, trusting, practical, shrewd, secure, self-controlled, and relaxed than in fact they were. The swimmers viewed their coaches as more sociable, intelligent, emotionally stable, less assertive, more happy-go-lucky, conscientious, adventurous, trusting, practical, forthright, self-assured and self-controlled, and relaxed than the objective test indicated. Both coaches and swimmers seemed to be rating each other in terms of what they would like rather than being realistic. It was also found that the father figure seems to have no real significance in the coaching situation and the swimmers' identification with coaches does not appear to revolve around the father figure stereotype. He also showed that swimming coaches, while being dominant, aggressive, driving, realistic, shrewd, self-sufficient, and radical in outlook, are additionally suspicious and insecure. This applied particularly to older coaches who may be affected by pressures of rising standards and the highly competitive atmosphere.

Hendry (41) in a follow-up study had 56 coaches subjectively

construct an "ideal" coach's personality profile. These ratings were then compared with 30 highly successful swimming coaches. There were no clear personality differences between the less successful coaches and the 30 selected as being highly successful coaches. The fact that the testing was conducted at the Amateur Swimming Association Championships would, of course, indicate that all 56 coaches studied were relatively successful. It was found that top class coaches and national or international standard junior swimmers have a similar view of the "ideal" coach stereotype--outgoing, dominant, stable, intelligent, conscientious, realistic, practical and confidently secure--a man of "innovation" and self-sufficiency. It is suggested that the similarity of construction stems on the one hand from the swimmers' needs for someone to lean on in crises, and, on the other, from the coaches' needs to be admired, dominant, and controlling figures.

Ogilvie (36) studied 132 high school coaches representing every major sport and concluded that it is possible to state reliably that most former athletes who remain associated with competitive athletics will be a hard driving, ambitious, highly organized individual. He will seek leadership roles, have a great psychological endurance and tend to be quick to accept blame. These men find it easy to express aggression without excessive guilt. They characteristically have a low need to express interest in the problems of others, nor do they expect others to show them special concern or interest. They are less inclined than most to study the motivation of others and would be quite slow to change their style of life.

Ogilvie (42) conducted another study dealing with the personality of national and regional coaches. The most significant traits found

in the profiles of men coaching at the highest national level were: emotional stability, conscience development, trusting nature, tough-mindedness, self-control and low resting levels of tension. These findings were highly consistent with the 132 high school coaches representing every major sport.

Summary of Reviewed Literature

Personality characteristics were found to vary according to the sport in which the athlete participated. Weight-trainers, for example, possessed personality traits that differed from basketball players. Several studies reported that personality differences exist between the athlete and non-athlete. For the athlete, winning becomes a psychological necessity. Certain personality traits are characteristic of most people who participate in athletics. These traits are: dominance, aggression, endurance, tough-mindedness, relaxed low tension level, emotional stability, self-discipline and conscientiousness.

Physical educators tend to rate significantly higher than other educators on the personality traits of dominance, sociability, succorance, nurturance and affiliation.

Coaches measured high in achievement, dominance, deference, order and those traits which determine getting ahead. Coaches as a group were low in needs intraception, exhibition, nurturance, and change. For the most part, coaches were reported to be hard-driving, ambitious, highly organized, and quick to seek leadership roles.

Although athletes, physical educators and coaches were examined independently, all three groups possessed many of the same personality characteristics.

CHAPTER II

METHODS AND PROCEDURES

Selecting the Test

It was obvious that a personality inventory would be necessary for the completion of this study. Two possible instruments were suggested by two professional counselors who were Eldon M. Gade, Professor Counseling and Guidance, and Beulah M. Hedahl, Director of the Counseling Center and Associate Professor of Psychology. The Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey was decided upon. The Edwards Personal Preference Schedule was also considered, but not used because of the thought that the Guilford-Zimmerman items were less embarrassing for the test participants than the Edwards items, and that the Guilford-Zimmerman items were easier to analyze and interpret for an individual without professional training in the Guidance and Counseling area.

The Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey (GTZS) is a 300 item "Yes" or "No" response survey which measures a person's personality in regard to the following ten items: general activity, restraint, ascendance, sociability, emotional stability, objectivity, friendliness, thoughtfulness, personal relations and masculinity. An average score for the test would be a raw score that would fall at the fiftieth percentile range. Anything above or below the fiftieth percentile range is either a high or a low score when compared with the norm or average established

for the test. The scores upon which the norms are based were obtained from 523 college men and 389 college women in one Southern California university and two junior colleges. The survey was also administered to California high school students and their parents so the age range was from 15 to 62. The GZTS requires about forty minutes for the average person to complete, although there is no time limit set. The reliability for each of the test items ranges from .79 to .85.

Gathering the Data

The subjects for this investigation represented a group of nineteen high school, college, and professional football coaches in attendance at the 1970 University of North Dakota Football Clinic. The purpose of the study was explained, and those interested in participating in the study were asked to remain and complete the questionnaire. The GZTS was then administered to the subjects in a classroom situation at the University Student Center.

The tests were hand scored, and the data treated in the following manner. The subjects received a score on each of the ten personality scales. The scores on each scale were totaled and the mean score found. The group means for each of the ten scales were recorded on a percentile profile chart to determine descriptive tendencies of the group.

CHAPTER III

RESULTS AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

Introduction

The subjects, plus their score results on each of the ten variables of the survey are described in this chapter. (For a complete description of each variable, refer to Chapter I of this study). An overview of the results is presented in Table 1. This table shows the mean score for each of the ten variables. The percentile rank is also indicated so that the group mean score for each scale can be transformed into a percentile rank score.

Description of Subjects

The group of nineteen subjects attending the coaching conference was used for the study. No attempts at increasing the sample size was made because this might introduce a subsample unlike the original group.

The nineteen coaches who participated in the study were a highly motivated sample of the population of eighty subjects. The participants in the research elected to forgo a Viking film in order to take the test.

The nineteen coaches who volunteered to be a part of the study consisted of nine coaches hired to coach and teach physical education,

TABLE 1

GROUP MEAN RAW SCORES OF MALE HIGH SCHOOL, COLLEGE,
AND PROFESSIONAL FOOTBALL COACHES ON THE
GUILFORD-ZIMMERMAN TEMPERAMENT SURVEY*

G	R	A	S	E	O	F	T	P	M	
										General Activity Energy
30	30	30	30	30	30	30	30	30	30	
29	29	29	30	29	29	28	29	29	29	
28	27	28				26	28			99
27	26	27	29	28	28	25	27	28	28	
26	25	26		27	27	24	26	27	27	
										Restraint Seriousness
25	24	25	28	26	26	23	25	26	26	
24	23	24	27	25	25	21	24	25	25	95
										Ascendance Social Boldness
23	22	22	26	24	24	20	23	24	24	
22	21	21	25	23	23	19	22	23	23	80
20	19	20	24	22	22	18	21	22	22	
20	18	18	22	20	20	16	20	20	23	70
19	17	17	21	19	19	15	19	19	23	
18	16	16	20	18	18	13	18	18	21	50
17	15	15	19	17	17	13	17	17	20	40
										Social Interest Sociability
16	14	14	18	16	16	12	16	16	19	
15	13	13	17	15	15	11	15	15	18	30
14	12	12	15	13	14	10	14	14		
										Emotional Stability
										Objectivity
										Friendliness Agreeableness
										Thoughtfulness Reflectiveness
										Personal Relations Cooperativeness
										Masculinity Femininity
										PERCENTILE RANK

*Adopted from the profile chart for the Guilford-Zimmerman
Temperament Survey for high school, college and adult ages.

six who indicated they were hired to coach and teach in an academic area, and the remaining four were hired strictly for coaching, with no other teaching responsibilities. Fifteen of the nineteen coaches had undergraduate teaching majors in physical education with a minor in another area. Four of the coaches had a minor in physical education with their major in an academic area. Of the sample tested, fifteen of the coaches were presently coaching at the high school level, two of the nineteen were coaching at the college level, and two of the coaches were involved with professional football coaching.

Of the fifteen high school coaches tested, six coached in high schools of approximately 100 to 400 students. Three coached in high schools of approximately 400 to 800 students. The remaining six coaches coached in high schools of 1000 to 1500 students.

The coaches tested indicated coaching records ranging from 30-70 won-loss to 90-10 won-loss. The average coach had a 65-35 won-loss record. The coaches tended to indicate the same percentage won-loss record while serving as an assistant and as a head coach.

The mean age of the coaches was 31.5 years, with a range from 25 through 54 years. The average coach had a mean of 6.3 years of coaching experience, composed of 2.3 years as an assistant coach and 4.0 years as a head coach.

Results of Survey

General Activity

A high percentile score indicates strong drive, energy and activity. This individual would generally tend to be enthusiastic, quick, lively, productive and efficient. It might be expected that

this factor would play a large part in the individual's desire and willingness to put forth the effort and time that would be necessary to become a great coach. On the other hand, a low percentile score would seem to indicate a slow, deliberate, inactive quality in a person.

As presented in Table 1, the mean for the group was 21, with a range of 8 to 30. This score indicates a percentile rank around the seventieth percentile. The need for general activity seems to play an important part in the success of a coach.

Restraint

As defined by Guilford and Zimmerman, the individual scoring high on this variable is said to be serious minded, deliberate, persistent and self-controlled. An extremely high score could indicate an over-serious individual, while an extremely low score would indicate low output, and poor leadership qualities. It can be assumed that an extremely high or low score would not be expected for a successful coach because over-seriousness and lack of leadership would not seem typical of a coach.

In computing the scores, it was found that the coaches had a raw score mean of 16, with a range of 11 to 23. This score was at the fiftieth percentile rank.

Ascendance

Persons who score high in ascendance possess the qualities of self-defense and leadership habits in speaking with individuals, to the public, and in persuading others. They tend to do more bluffing and would be more conspicuous. Leadership activities are required of coaches as well as the ability to motivate athletes who compete in

athletics. On the other end of the scale persons who score low on ascendance are said to be submissive, and have hesitation in speaking in public and with individuals, and try to avoid being conspicuous.

Because of the above factors, it could be expected that a coach would probably score high in this variable. Table 1 indicates that the mean of the coaches was 17, with a range of 8 to 23. The percentile rank for the group tested fell in the upper fiftieth percentile. It might be concluded that being a successful coach would require an above average amount of social boldness.

Sociability

On this variable, it might be expected a high score in sociability indicates that the individual is inclined to have many friends and acquaintances. In addition, he likes conversation and social activities. He may actually seek the limelight.

One might expect a coach to score relatively high in this area for in coaching it is necessary for the coach to be verbal and involved in athletic and social activities. Conversely, a low score in this category includes avoidance of social contacts and the person tends to refrain from conversation and is usually shy.

On this variable, the mean score of the group was 21, with a range of 3 to 29. This score is in the upper fiftieth percentile when compared to the norm group.

Emotional Stability

To score high on this trait, an individual would indicate a high degree of optimism and cheerfulness. The individual has little fluctuation

in his moods, is composed, and seems to feel good in emotional health. Basically, this would indicate a desirable emotional stability. It could be hypothesized that an outstanding coach would be a cheerful and stable person who is optimistic and can stand the emotional pressures of coaching. A low score would indicate fluctuation of moods, feelings of guilt, worry, and neurotic tendencies. If a person was bothered by these pressures, chances are the individual would not remain in coaching.

The coaches scored relatively high on this variable. The mean for the group was 20, with a range of 12 to 26. This score when converted to a percentile would be about at the sixty-fifth percentile.

Objectivity

Guilford and Zimmerman describe a high score on this variable as indicating insensitivity, while a very low score could indicate touchiness. In general, a higher score means "thickskinned" in comparison to being hypersensitive, self-centered, and suspicious. It would be expected that coaches would score about average on this variable because coaches are expected to be a little "hardnosed."

As revealed in Table 1, the mean for the group tested was 18, with a range of 10 to 26. This was an average score falling at the fiftieth percentile rank.

Friendliness

Scoring high in friendliness could mean a lack of fighting tendencies, or it could mean a realistic handling of frustrations and injuries, and a desire to be liked. A low score indicates hostility to a certain extent and a fighting attitude. The scorer may be belligerent

and have contempt for others.

The results in Table 1 indicated that the mean for the group of coaches on this variable was 14, with a range of 8 to 21. This score is at the fiftieth percentile.

Thoughtfulness

Persons who score high in thoughtfulness are reflective, philosophically inclined, self-observant and interested in thinking. They may have a small advantage over those who are more interested in overt activity because the extrovert of this type is so busy interacting with his social environment that he fails to observe other people and may be lacking in tact.

Table 1 indicates that the mean for the group of coaches was 18, with a range of 11 to 25. This score represented the fiftieth percentile rank.

Personal Relations

This variable represents the core of getting along with others. A person who scores high tends to be tolerant of others and their weaknesses. Persons who score low tend to find fault with other people and with institutions generally. This is the person who is not likely to "to get along with others." Because the coach is the leader of a team, it is necessary for him to manipulate or get the most out of his team members; therefore, "getting along with other," becomes a very important part of his job. It would be expected that outstanding coaches would score high on this variable.

When looking at the results shown in Table 1, one can see that the mean for the group was 19, with a range of 12 to 26. This score represents a high fiftieth percentile.

Masculinity

According to Guilford and Zimmerman, a high score indicates that the man behaves in ways that are characteristic of men and is probably understood and accepted by them. On the positive end of the scale one is not easily disgusted and is resistant to fear. A low score would indicate a tendency toward feminine traits of sympathy, fear, romance, and emotional expressiveness.

As can be seen in Table 1, the coaches had a mean of 22 on this variable, with a range of 15 to 27. This score represents a percentile score around the sixty-eighth percentile.

Summary

Of the ten variables measured by the Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey, six resulted in above average scores.

It was found that three of the variables--general activity, emotional stability, and masculinity--resulted in mean scores which were in the seventieth percentile rank. Three other variables--ascendancy, sociability, and personal relations--represented scores in the upper fiftieth percentile range.

The following variables--restraint, objectivity, friendliness, and thoughtfulness--represented scores which ranked at the fiftieth percentile.

The individual raw scores showed a great deal of variability between individuals. Raw scores ranged from less than the fifth percentile up to the ninety-ninth percentile. However, the mean scores ranged from the fiftieth percentile to approximately the seventy-fifth percentile.

CHAPTER IV

DISCUSSION

Nineteen of the coaches were willing to participate and stayed to complete the survey. Many of the coaches who did not participate in the study were interested but preferred to view the professional football game films being shown at the same time in an adjacent room. The fact that nineteen stayed in spite of the excellent game films being shown in the next room would indicate that they were a highly motivated and interested group. The two professional coaches present at the clinic were most anxious to complete the survey, and one of the two stated that members of the professional football staff he was affiliated with frequently talked of the need for such a study. Several high school and college coaches from a distant city indicated their interest and willingness to complete the survey. However, they were unable to do so because of their planned departure at that particular time. The college and professional coaches were the most interested in the survey. Many of the college coaches from within the city as well as several graduate teaching assistants at the University indicated a desire to complete the survey at another time.

Although there is not a great deal of variability between the raw score items, it is expected that reasons for this do exist and should be considered. After reading the explanations of the terms

restraint, objectivity, friendliness, and thoughtfulness, it appears that neither an extremely high or low score would be ideal. A score at or near the fiftieth percentile would indicate a well-adjusted individual in regard to these four items. In the items of ascendance, sociability and personal relations, the coaches scored in the upper fiftieth percentile range possibly indicating a tendency toward interest in people and social activities. The coaches scored highest on the traits of general activity, emotional stability, and masculinity. These later traits seem to be desirable coaching traits, but the desirable level or percentile rank ideal for all coaches cannot be predicted from this study. However, the results can be compared to other studies as reported in the related literature.

Ogilvie (39) found that coaches rated high on need for achievement when tested using the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule. This need compared with the high general activity need found in this study using the Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey. Hendry (41) using Cattell's 16 PF questionnaire found coaches to be what he termed stable and dominant. These terms used by Cattell mean much the same as the terms emotional stability and ascendance used by Guilford and Zimmerman. These traits ranked high in the coaches described in this study. The high masculinity and social interest scores reported here were also mentioned in much of the research done on the personalities of athletes.

The fact that none of the mean scores showed a great deal of variability from the fiftieth percentile would indicate that coaches do not differ greatly from the average individual as brought out in the norms established by the Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey.

Even though it was not a major purpose of this study, it did not

appear that those coaches with outstanding won-loss records had raw scores that differed from those with poorer won-loss records.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

The purpose of the study was to describe the personality characteristics of coaches as measured by the Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey. Of a population of approximately eighty coaches in attendance at the 1970 University of North Dakota Football Clinic, nineteen coaches volunteered to participate in the study.

Each individual's ten raw scale scores were totaled and means for each variable were computed and recorded on the standard profile sheet designed by Guilford and Zimmerman. The raw scores were converted into percentile scores when recorded on the profile sheet.

Conclusions

Within the limits of the study, it would appear that coaches possess similar personality traits as to the norm group. The description of the personality traits of the nineteen football coaches tested is as follows: The coaches as a group rated in the lower seventieth percentile rank in general activity, in the mid-sixtieth percentile rank on emotional stability and masculinity, and in the upper fiftieth percentile on ascendance, sociability, and personal relations.

The coaches scored at the fiftieth percentile on restraint,

objectivity, friendliness and thoughtfulness using the Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey.

Recommendations

As a result of this investigation, it is recommended that additional research be conducted on the personality traits of coaches for more conclusive evidence.

It is recommended that a large number of coaches of different sports be studied to determine whether or not personality differences exist between coaches of various sports.

It would be worthwhile to study the personality traits of winning and losing coaches at the high school, college and professional levels.

A descriptive personality study of women coaches as well as a comparative study with male coaches would seem meaningful.

It is recommended that the Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey be administered to prospective coaches to see how they compare with veteran coaches.

A final recommendation would be to administer several personality surveys to a group of coaches to further analyze their personalities. In such a study, the Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey, Edwards Personal Preference Schedule and Cattell's 16 PF among others could be used.

REFERENCES

1. Lake, John. "High-Pressure Coach." Newsweek, January 29, 1969, p. 75.
2. Davis, Nolan. "Ram at the Top." Newsweek, January 20, 1969, p. 61.
3. Cattell, Raymond B. Descriptive and Measurement of Personality. New York: World Book Company, 1946, p. 566.
4. Funk and Wagnalls. New Standard Dictionary of the English Language. New York: Funk and Wagnalls Company, 1961, p. 184.
5. Edwards, Allen L. Manual. Edwards Personal Preference Schedule Second Edition Revised. New York: The Psychological Corporation, 1959, p. 11.
6. Guilford, J. P. and Zimmerman, W. S. Manual. Guilford Zimmerman Temperament Survey. California: Sheridan Supply Company, 1949, p. 1.
7. Booth, E. G., Jr. "Personality Traits of Athletes as Measured by the MMPI." Research Quarterly, May, 1958, pp. 127-138.
8. Lakie, William L. "Personality Characteristics of Certain Groups of Intercollegiate Athletes." Research Quarterly, December, 1962, pp. 566-573.
9. Hughes, Thomas. "A Study of Personality Characteristics of a Selected Group of Springfield College Freshman." Unpublished Master's Thesis, Springfield College, Springfield, Massachusetts, 1963.
10. Kroll, W. and Peterson, K. H. "Personality Factor Profiles of Collegiate Football Teams." Research Quarterly, December, 1965, pp. 441-447.
11. Johnson, Warren R.; Hutton, Daniel C.; and Johnson, Granville B., Jr. "Projective Traits of Some Champion Athletes by Two Projective Techniques: Rorschach and H-T-P." Research Quarterly, December, 1954, p. 484.

12. Kjeldsen, Erick. "A Study to Determine the Relationships Between the EPPS and Participation in Gymnastics." Unpublished Master's Thesis, Springfield College, Springfield, Massachusetts, 1961.
13. Flanagan, Lance. "A Study of Some Personality Traits of Different Physical Activity Groups." Research Quarterly, October, 1951, pp. 312-323.
14. Husman, B. F. "Aggression in Boxers and Wrestlers as Measured by Projective Techniques." Research Quarterly, December, 1955, pp. 421-425.
15. LaPlace, John B. "Personality and Its Relationship to Success in Professional Baseball." Research Quarterly, October, 1954, pp. 313-319.
16. Kroll, William. "Personality Factor Profiles of Collegiate Wrestlers." Research Quarterly, March, 1967, pp. 49-57.
17. Leithwood, K. "Personality Characteristics of Weight-Trainers." Master's Thesis, University of British Columbia, 1967.
18. Henry, Franklin M. "Personality Differences in Athletes, Physical Education and Aviation Students." Psychology Bulletin, July, 1941, p. 745.
19. Thune, John B. "Personality of Weight-Lifters." Research Quarterly, October, 1949, pp. 296-306.
20. Harlow, R. G. "Masculine Inadequacy and Compensatory Development of Physique." Journal of Personality, XIX (June, 1951), pp. 321-323.
21. Hunt, David H. "A Cross Racial Comparison of Personality Traits Between Athletes and Non-Athletes." Research Quarterly, December, 1969, pp. 704-707.
22. Sperling, A. P. "The Relationship Between Personality Adjustment and Achievement in Physical Education Activities." Research Quarterly, October, 1942, pp. 351-363.
23. Nelson, D. O. and Langer, P. "Getting to Know Your Players." Athletic Journal, XLIV (September, 1963), p. 39.
24. Langer, P. "Some Psychological Implications of Varsity Football Performance." Coach and Athlete, September, 1966, p. 31.
25. Carter, Gerald C. and Shannon, J. R. "Adjustment and Personality Traits of Athletes and Non-Athletes." School Review, February, 1940, pp. 127-130.

26. Slusher, Howard. "Personality and Intelligence Characteristics of Selected High School Athletes and Non-Athletes." Research Quarterly, December, 1964, pp. 539-545.
27. Behrman, Robert M. "Personality Differences Between Non-Swimmers and Swimmers." Research Quarterly, May, 1967, pp. 163-171.
28. Black, J. D. "Results of Female College Students: Basic Reading on the MMPI." Health and Fitness in the Modern World, 1961, p. 255.
29. Bird, Anne Marie. "A Comparative Study of Certain Personality Characteristics of College Women Participating in Basketball and Modern Dance." Unpublished Master's Thesis, University of Maryland, 1965.
30. Ramsey, Lorene Maria. "A Comparison of the Personality Variables and Attitudes Toward Physical Education Between Highly Skilled Girls Participating in Varsity Programs and in Girls' Athletic Association Programs." Unpublished Master's Thesis, Women's College, University of North Carolina, Greensboro, North Carolina, 1962.
31. Peterson, Sheri L. "A Comparison of Personality Traits of Women Athletes who Compete in Team and Individual Sports." Unpublished Master's Thesis, University of Oklahoma, 1965.
32. Neal, Patsy E. "Personality Traits of United States Women Athletes who Participated in the 1959 Pan-American Games, as Measured by the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule." Unpublished Master's Thesis, University of Utah, 1963.
33. Ogilvie, Bruce C. "What is an Athlete?" JOHPER, June, 1967, p. 48.
34. Johnsgard, K. W. and Ogilvie, B. C. "The Competitive Race Driver." Encyclopedia of Sports Medicine. McGraw-Hill, 1967.
35. Ogilvie, Bruce C. "The Personality of the Male Athlete." The Academy Papers. Tucson, Arizona: The American Academy of Physical Education, 1967.
36. Ogilvie, Bruce C. "Psychological Consistencies Within the Personality of High Level Competitors." Journal of American Medical Association, CCV (September, 1968), p. 780.
37. Locke, Lawrence F. "Performance of Male Physical Educators on Selected Psychological Tests." Research Quarterly, October, 1962, pp. 418-429.
38. LoMaglio, A. Peter. "Performance of Male Physical Educators on Selected Psychological Tests." Unpublished D. P. E. Thesis, Springfield College, 1958.

39. Ogilvie, Bruce C. and Tutko, T. A. "Self-Image and Measured Personality of Coaches." Paper prepared for Second International Congress of Sports Psychology, Washington, D. C., 1968.
40. Hendry, L. B. "The Assessment of Personality Traits in the Coach Swimmer Relationship, and a Preliminary Examination of the 'Father-Figure' Stereotype." Research Quarterly, October, 1968, pp. 543-551.
41. Hendry, L. B. "A Personality Study of Highly Successful and 'Ideal' Swimming Coaches." Research Quarterly, May, 1969, pp. 299-305.
42. Ogilvie, Bruce C. Personality Profile of Successful Coaches. Proceedings Sports Injury Clinic, University of Wisconsin, 1965. Allan Ryan, M. D., Editor.